DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 436 254 PS 028 090

AUTHOR Gambrell, Linda B.; Mazzoni, Susan Anders
TITLE Emergent Literacy: What Research Reveals about Learning To Read.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 27p.; In: The Early Childhood Curriculum: Current Findings in Theory and Practice. Third Edition; see PS 028 086.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; Early Childhood Education; *Elementary School Curriculum; *Emergent Literacy; *Preschool Curriculum; *Reading Instruction; Reading Motivation; Reading Research; Student Motivation; Young Children

ABSTRACT

Noting that the questions of when and how to teach beginning reading are among the most controversial in early childhood education, this chapter examines how young children develop as readers. The chapter begins with a focus on the emergent literacy perspective for the insights it provides into young children's reading and writing development. The chapter then presents factors associated with learning to read successfully, including: (1) family literacy practices such as storybook reading and environmental print experiences; and (2) classroom-based literacy practices related to the social and motivational context and opportunities for challenge, choice, and collaboration, and storybook or shared reading. The chapter provides an overview of what current theory and research suggest young children need to know to develop into successful readers, including phonological awareness, alphabetic understanding, phonics instruction, and reading as a meaning-getting process. The chapter concludes with a review of several studies focusing on characteristics of effective literacy instruction. Contains approximately 140 references. (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 436 254

CHAPTER 4

Emergent Literacy: What Research Reveals About Learning to Read

LINDA B. GAMBRELL
SUSAN ANDERS MAZZONI

Amy Detjen

2B

THE QUESTIONS of when and how to teach beginning reading are among the most controversial topics in early childhood education. One of the reasons for the continuing controversy is that we all care so deeply about helping our children become successful in developing the literacy skills that provide the foundation for education and the ideals of a democratic society (Adams, 1990).

While definitions of reading vary, most of them acknowledge the common elements of print, language, and comprehension. There is a general consensus in the research community that reading is a *constructive* and *interactive* process. That is, reading is viewed as a meaning-making process that involves not only the reader but also the text and the contextual setting in which reading is taking place (Gambrell, 1996; Guthrie, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978). The constructive-interactive view also posits that reading is a cognitive process and that different instructional practices as well as assessment techniques are necessary in order to tap the multitude of factors involved in reading.

In this chapter we examine how young children develop as readers. First, we focus on the concept of emergent literacy for the insights it provides about young children's reading and writing development. We then move to a review of the theory and research on home and school factors associated with learning to read. Next, we provide an overview of what current theory and research suggest young children need to know in order to develop into successful readers. We conclude with a review of sev-

The Early Childhood Curriculum: Current Findings in Theory and Practice. Copyright © 1999 by Teachers College, Columbia University. All rights reserved. ISBN 0-8077-3781-X (pbk). Prior to photocopying items for classroom use, please contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Customer Service, 222 Rosewood Dr., Danvers, MA 01923, USA, tel. (508) 750-8400.

PS 028090

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

eral studies that focus on the characteristics of effective literacy instruction. Throughout the chapter we emphasize research that explores how children develop literacy knowledge, motivation, and behaviors.

THE EMERGENT LITERACY PERSPECTIVE

Over the past 10 years, a new view of early literacy development has emerged that has had a profound impact on how we think about beginning reading instruction. Prior to the 1960s, researchers believed that young children would benefit from reading instruction only when a certain level of cognitive, social, emotional, and physical maturity had been attained. This perspective, known as "reading readiness," suggested that reading instruction should be withheld until the child had either "naturally" matured to a mental age of 6½ years (Morphett & Washburne, 1931) or had acquired the skills necessary to pass a reading readiness test. The reading readiness view of learning was based on the belief that certain specific skills (e.g., auditory discrimination, left-to-right eye progression, large motor skills) had to be attained before a child would be able to profit from reading instruction.

Since the 1960s, there has been a gradual shift away from the reading readiness perspective toward a view of literacy as an emerging set of knowledge and skills that have their beginnings in very young children. For almost all children, learning to read and write begins very early in life. Even as infants, children have experiences with written language as parents read them books and engage them in playing with alphabet blocks. At 2 or 3 years of age, many children can identify signs, labels, and logos that are a part of their environment (Teale & Sulzby, 1987).

As researchers began to observe and report the literacy activities of preschool children, they found that young children engage in a wide range of emergent literacy behaviors, such as listening to stories, discussing stories, making up stories, scribbling "letters" to family and friends, writing their names, and creating invented printlike signs (Clay, 1977, 1979). Today there is general consensus in the research community that literacy learning is a process that begins at birth, when babies begin to experiment with oral language (Clay, 1977; Hiebert, 1981).

Prior to formal reading instruction, young children interact with others in their homes and communities and experience the forms, functions, conventions, and values of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Research by Clay (1979) has documented that, as a result of their interactions with others, young children develop logical, though unconventional, strategies about writing and comprehending the written word as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

well as important competencies that contribute to literacy development—such as understanding that print communicates meaning and that there is a difference between print and drawing, understanding the difference between "words" and "letters," and understanding how to handle books. This view, known as the "emergent literacy" perspective (Teale & Sulzby, 1988), views young children as continuously "in the process of becoming literate" (p. 197), as opposed to viewing children as "ready" to learn to read at a given point in time. The emergent years continue until the child is independently reading and writing at a conventional level (L. M. McGee & Purcell-Gates, 1997).

Since research supports the premise that children develop knowledge and values about literacy prior to formal schooling, the emergent perspective also suggests that children are best benefited by providing classroom reading experiences that build on their understandings about literacy in order to help them gradually develop more conventional reading and writing practices (Purcell-Gates, 1994, 1996). Moreover, contrary to the reading readiness perspective, there is mounting evidence to suggest that children benefit from reading instruction prior to the first grade (Blatchford, 1987; Teale & Sulzby, 1987), regardless of ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic differences (Hansen & Farrell, 1995). In fact, research has shown that many of the reading readiness skills can be acquired *while* learning to read (Ehri, 1979).

The emergent literacy perspective reflects the view that literacy is a continuum that begins at birth and continues throughout life. This perspective also acknowledges that reading and writing develop concurrently and interrelatedly in young children (Teale & Sulzby, 1987). Researchers have identified clear developmental patterns that emerge when children endeavor to read and write. In the emergent literacy perspective, these attempts should be recognized as valuable approximations toward more conventional reading and writing practices.

Sulzby (1985), who studied hundreds of preschool children reading storybooks, described five stages of children's emergent reading of favorite storybooks. During the first stage, children as young as 2 or 3 may begin "reading" by pointing to pictures and naming them without weaving a story around the pictures. In the next three stages, children still attend to pictures but also tell oral stories that sound mostly conversational. Children's oral intonation eventually sounds as if they are reading; using picture prompts, they tell stories that are complete and sound as if they are written. The final stage of emergent storybook reading involves the child's attempting to attend to print.

In young children, the development of reading and writing are closely linked. For example, Harste (1989) showed that writing improved

children's reading skills and decoding skills. According to Teale and Sulzby (1988), "children do not first learn to read and then learn to write" (p. 3); therefore, it seems appropriate that we speak of literacy development, not of reading readiness or of prereading. It is important that educators recognize and build on the close and complementary relationship between reading and writing in the literacy experiences that we provide for young children.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH LEARNING TO READ SUCCESSFULLY

Clearly, learning to read is a complex process. Researchers have examined a range of factors to determine if there are relationships between learning to read and family literacy practices such as storybook reading, exposure to environmental print, and home–school connections. Likewise, research has focused on a range of classroom factors to determine if there are relationships between learning to read and classroom-based literacy practices such as the social and motivational context of the classroom, teacher storybook reading, and shared reading experiences.

Family Literacy Practices

Researchers are becoming increasingly aware of how young children's social environment mediates literacy learning. Many researchers (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1979; Gee, 1992; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978, 1987) have drawn on social-constructivist perspectives, which posit that learners construct knowledge as a result of interaction with others within sociocultural contexts. Some emergent literacy research grounded in the social-constructivist perspective has attempted to determine family literacy practices that contribute to emergent literacy knowledge (Heath, 1983; Purcell-Gates, 1996). Other ressearchers have investigated how differences in children's knowledge about print affect their interpretation of the instruction received during schooling (Dyson, 1984; Heath, 1983; Purcell-Gates & Dahl, 1991), as well as how the social context of the classroom community affects learning (Purcell-Gates & Dahl, 1991).

Storybook Reading. The single most important literacy activity for building the knowledge and skills that are eventually required for reading is having an adult or adults who read aloud to the child on a continuing basis (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985). It appears that children make the most growth when the materials that are read aloud are slightly above the child's vocabulary and syntax level (Chomsky, 1972).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Some researchers assert that it is the interactive nature of the storybook reading that makes the most substantial contribution to literacy development (Adams, 1990; Teale, 1984; Wigfield & Asher, 1984). Parents or other adults support and nurture children's literacy development during read-aloud experiences when they build on the child's comments about the text; pose challenging questions; suggest alternative interpretations; encourage personal reactions; draw attention to letters, words, and illustrations; and engage in extended discussions about the text.

Interestingly, recent research by Bus (1994) demonstrated that a young child's interest in storybook reading with a parent appears to relate primarily to the intimate, shared time with a parent as opposed to reading the book itself. In summary, there is evidence to suggest that children who read early have books readily accessible to them (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1988; Morrow, 1983; Sticht & McDonald, 1989) and have parents who read to them often (Adams, 1990; Durkin, 1966; Sulzby & Teale, 1991).

There is much to be gained from reading and discussing books with children. Clay (1979) and Smith (1988) propose that the read-aloud experience helps children learn about the features of written language. Children learn that written language is different from oral language, that print generates meaning, and that printed words on a page have sounds. According to Mason (1983), children who are read to by an adult develop metacognitive knowledge about how to approach reading tasks. Metacognition, one's own awareness about how learning takes place in particular settings, is clearly associated with literacy development (Flavell, 1976; Mason, 1983).

The behaviors of the adult during read-aloud experiences have been found to be associated with literacy development. These specific parent/adult behaviors include questioning, scaffolding dialogue and responses, positive feedback, offering extended information, clarifying information, restating information, directing discussion, sharing personal reactions, and relating concepts to life experiences. Flood (1977) described the reading styles of parents during read-aloud sessions with prekindergarten children. He found that the following parent behaviors were among the best predictors of children's success on readiness scores: (1) number of preparatory questions asked by the parent, (2) number of poststory evaluative questions asked by the parent, and (3) positive reinforcement offered by the parent.

Heath's (1980) research revealed that interactive language behaviors that occur during read-aloud experiences change over time as children get older. Parents initially expect very young children to interrupt stories, and the parents accept dialogue and questioning from the children during

the story-reading event. By the age of 3, Heath observed, the child is expected to listen to the story and learn information from it, as in traditional school settings. The adult begins to question the child after a reading to determine content understanding and recall. Sulzby and Teale (1991), in their study of the storybook reading behaviors of eight families, found similar changes over time in the interactive patterns between parents and children.

Though a plethora of home literacy events have been found to occur in lower-socioeconomic-status (SES) communities, research has documented that children from these communities generally score lower on literacy measures than children from middle-income communities (Kaestle, Damon-Moore, Stedman, Tinsley, & Trollinger, 1991). One hypothesis to explain this difference is that adults from the middle-income "mainstream" spend more time reading aloud to children (Adams, 1990; Heath, 1983), though it is important to note that variation in family literacy practices may be great within a single community (Heath, 1983).

In summary, research on read-aloud experiences, also referred to as interactive reading and shared reading, has documented its positive effect on children's interest in reading (Cullinan, 1992; Huck, 1992), familiarity with book language (Anderson et al., 1985), awareness of story structure (Morrow & Weinstein, 1982), verbal expression and vocabulary (Purcell-Gates, 1988; Wells, 1985; Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998), and story comprehension (Morrow & Weinstein, 1982; Wells, 1986). Consequently, many current intervention programs for young children incorporate an emphasis on interactive storybook reading (Fox, 1990; Meyerhoff & White, 1986; Morrow & O'Connor, 1995) as well as increased access to books (Gambrell, Almasi, Xie, & Heland, 1995), both of which have resulted in positive gains in children's literacy growth.

Environmental Print Experiences. Research has identified a variety of literacy events in homes across a range of SES communities that afford opportunities for children to learn about print. For example, reading and writing experiences in low-SES homes have been found to include demonstrations of reading texts on containers, flyers, coupons, advertisements, and movie or TV notices; writing grocery lists; signing names; participation in story and Bible-study experiences; and written communication with social services (Purcell-Gates, 1996; D. Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988; Teale & Sulzby, 1988). The frequency of literacy activities and the degree of children's participation in literacy events in the home have been shown to relate to young children's reading motivation (Baker, Serpell, & Sonnenschein, 1995; Lomax, 1976; Morrow, 1983; Rowe, 1991) and knowledge about the function of print and the alphabetic prin-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ciple, though different practices appear to be related to different types of knowledge (Purcell-Gates, 1996). Some researchers argue that the presence of environmental print in a literate society such as ours helps to ensure children's understanding about the forms and functions of print (Goodman & Goodman, 1979); however, recent research suggests that if parents and their children do not view print as useful within their own cultural communities, environmental print may contribute little to emergent literacy knowledge (Purcell-Gates, 1994).

Home-School Connections. As described earlier, research has shown that children experience literacy differently as a result of their home cultures. However, it is important that educators focus on what students can do and draw upon these strengths in order to address student's needs. Swap (1993) argued that some parent involvement programs assume a "deficit" model, that is, non-mainstream-culture families are "deficient" and are in need of remediation regarding how they can fit the practices in schools. On the other hand, an "anti-deficit" model is grounded in the view that children will benefit from experiences and instruction that draw upon their home and community life. If we believe in the associative capacity of human cognition, then a range of home and community experiences can be viewed as relevant and meaningful for classroom literacy instruction.

Recently, research has begun to focus on home–school connections, or lack of home–school connections, and their effects on children's learning. One of the most influential studies that shed light on the influence of home–school connections on children was conducted by Heath (1983), who found that cultural mismatches between parent–child and teacher–child linguistic interactions affected children's performance in school. Similarly, Au (1980) found that Hawaiian children performed better when reading lessons incorporated "talk story" as opposed to the traditional lesson format (teacher asks a question/students respond/teacher evaluates). Research has demonstrated that the home and community, as well as preschool literacy experiences, can shape children's literacy knowledge and such knowledge may impede or facilitate learning in school (Dahl & Freppon, 1995; McGill-Franzen & Lanford, 1994; Neuman & Roskos, 1997; Purcell-Gates & Dahl, 1991; Sonnenschein et al., 1996; D. Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988).

Classroom-Based Literacy Practices

The Social Context of Classroom Literacy Experiences. A number of researchers have investigated the classroom social environment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and its effects on literacy learning. One reason that children read and write involves an intrinsic desire to interact with others (Wigfield, 1994). Socially supportive classroom environments, where children are encouraged to discuss and share reading and writing with peers, have been found to enhance the literacy motivation of first- (Gambrell, 1993), second- (Morrow & Rand, 1994), and third-graders (Ng, Guthrie, McCann, VanMeter, & Alao, 1996). Other studies have shown that collaboration promotes achievement and higher-level cognition (Morrow & Smith, 1990). These studies support the notion that learning is enhanced when the classroom environment reflects a community of literacy learners (Brown, 1994) and when children and their parents are invited to "join the literacy club" (Smith, 1988).

Research also suggests that teachers can encourage collaborative interaction among peers by asking fewer questions or by using nonquestioning techniques, such as rephrasing or restating children's comments (Orsolini & Pontecorvo, 1992). However, none of the studies reviewed suggested that children benefit from collaborative discussions about text when teachers remove themselves completely from the discussion process. K. G. McGee (1992) reported that first-graders who participated in peer-led discussions (with the teacher present) and who were asked a single teacher-posed interpretive question tended to provide many more interpretive responses than the peer-led group that was not asked the teacher-posed question. Wiseman, Many, and Altieri (1992) found that teacher-guided discussion that focused third-graders' attention on thinking and talking about aesthetic and literary responses was a more effective instructional context for enriching students' experiences of a literary work than non-teacher-guided discussion. Even though social approaches to learning are supported by a consistent and compelling research base, some researchers have suggested that students should not work collaboratively all the time because they need to learn how to work within other classroom contexts as well (Johnson, Johnson, Holebec, & Roy, 1984).

The Motivational Context of Classroom Literacy Experiences. One important long-term goal of beginning reading instruction is to foster an intrinsic desire to read. Effective readers must possess both the skill and the will to read (Anderson et al., 1985; Borkowski, Carr, Rellinger, & Pressley, 1990; Gambrell, 1996; Paris & Oka, 1986), yet there is evidence to suggest that as grade level increases, children tend to have less positive attitudes toward reading (McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, 1995). It is important to note that children who are motivated and who spend more time reading are better readers (Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988; Morrow,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1992; B. M. Taylor, Frye, & Maruyama, 1990). Supporting and nurturing reading motivation and achievement are crucial to improving educational prospects for children who find learning to read difficult (Allington, 1986, 1991; Smith-Burke, 1989).

Motivation is a broad construct in the affective domain that encompasses an individual's set of beliefs, values, and goals that guide their actions (Wigfield & Karpathian, 1991). How can teachers create an environment in which students will be motivated to read? Research suggests that classroom cultures that foster reading motivation at the first-, second-, and third-grade levels are characterized by environments that promote challenge, choice, and collaboration (Gambrell, 1996; Gambrell & Morrow, 1995; Morrow, 1992; Turner, 1995).

Opportunities for Challenge. Recent theories emphasize that self-perceived competence or capability beliefs are strongly tied to motivation (Ford, 1992; McCombs, 1989). In other words, children's beliefs about how well they can read will influence whether they approach or avoid reading tasks. The important question, then, is how we can provide a motivating instructional context that supports children in developing positive capability beliefs with respect to their reading ability. According to Bandura (1986), the single greatest predictor of self-perceived competence and task engagement is success.

Recent literacy motivation studies have revealed important insights about the kind of success that is needed to foster self-perceived competence in learners (Spaulding, 1992; Turner, 1992). These studies suggest that children's capability beliefs are enhanced when they are successful at *challenging* learning tasks. Challenging tasks are those tasks that are appropriate for the learner, in that they are not too easy, nor are they too difficult. When a learning task is too easy, children become uninterested and do not feel personal accomplishment when they successfully complete the task. On the other hand, if the task is too difficult, children become frustrated and "turned off," and they often give up on completing the task. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that repeated exposure to failure tends to generate increasingly negative attitudes, self-concepts, and expectations about reading (Johnston & Winograd, 1985), all of which are associated with low motivation (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996). When young readers try yet do not succeed in learning to read, they often become unmotivated and inactive because their previous efforts have not produced positive results, and they expect the same pattern of effort and failure to occur in later attempts. They may attribute their failure to uncontrollable factors such as luck or teacher skill and consequently cease trying to learn. Johnston and Winograd (1985) pro-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

posed the term *passive failure* to describe poor readers who disassociate effort with outcome, credit success to uncontrollable forces, and attribute failure to lack of ability. The result of passive failure is that poor readers often do not develop motivational patterns, and their lack of effort then contributes to a cycle of failure.

In further support of the contention that affective factors are related to reading achievement, McKenna and colleagues (1995) found a strong positive relationship between children's recreational attitudes toward reading and reading achievement in a study of children in grades 1 through 6 across the United States. The authors stated that their findings suggested that "a reader's history of success or frustration plays a central role in shaping attitude" (p. 936). Thus it is critical that teachers assess students' strengths and needs so that appropriate and challenging literacy experiences can be provided that afford growth in achievement as well as foster feelings of competence and capability (also see Vygotsky's [1978] notion of the "zone of proximal development").

Opportunities for Choice. In motivational theory and research, the role of choice in general and reading motivation in particular is well recognized (Spaulding, 1992). Studies of first- and third-graders have found that when children told researchers about both narrative and information books they "most enjoyed" reading, more than 80% responded that they had self-selected the books from the classroom libraries (Gambrell, 1995; Gambrell et al., 1995; Palmer, Codling, & Gambrell, 1994). Only 10% of the children in these studies talked about books or stories that had been assigned by the teacher. Researchers have documented that task engagement and motivation increase when students are provided with opportunities to make choices about their learning (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Turner, 1995). In addition, findings from a number of studies suggest a strong correlation between choice and the development of intrinsic motivation (Paris & Oka, 1986; Rodin, Rennert, & Solomon, 1980; Turner, 1992).

A number of studies during the past decade have also provided support for the notion that when children have environments that are book-rich, the motivation to read is high (Elley, 1992; Gambrell, 1993; Lundberg & Linnakyla, 1993; Morrow, 1992; Purcell-Gates, McIntyre, & Freppon, 1995), although there is evidence to suggest that a book-rich classroom environment is not sufficient for the development of highly motivated readers (Ingham, 1981).

Opportunities for Collaboration. Recent conceptualizations of motivation have been developed that reflect the important role of collaboration in motivation to learn (McCombs, 1989; Oldfather, 1993). Current

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

theories of motivation recognize that learning is facilitated by social interactions among peers (McCombs, 1989), and they acknowledge the social nature of literacy learning (Brandt, 1990; Oldfather, 1993). The opportunity to socially interact with others has been shown to foster both reading motivation and reading development (Almasi & Gambrell, 1994; Gambrell, 1995, 1996; Guthrie, Schafer, Wang, & Afflerbach, 1993; Mullis, Campbell, & Farstrup, 1993; Slavin, 1990). For these reasons, collaboration is viewed as a critical dimension of the motivating instructional context as well.

Storybook Reading in the Early Childhood Classroom. Several studies using experimental designs have investigated the effects of storybook reading as a regular classroom practice on children's achievement in various aspects of literacy development. In these investigations, the children in the experimental classrooms who were read to daily over long periods of time scored significantly better on measures of vocabulary, comprehension, and decoding ability than children in the control groups who were not read to by an adult (Bus, Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini, 1995; Dickinson & Smith, 1994; Elley, 1989; Feitelson, Goldstein, Iraqi, & Share, 1993).

In studies carried out in school settings where children participated with their teacher and/or peers in some part of the storybook-reading experience, their comprehension and sense of story structure improved in comparison to children in a control group. The storybook-reading experiences involved activities implemented *prior* to story reading, *during* story reading, and *after* story reading. Activities implemented prior to story reading included previewing the story through discussion, prediction, and setting a purpose for listening prior to the story's being read. Activities implemented during the story reading focused on issues related to the story that were spontaneously discussed at appropriate times. Activities implemented after the reading included discussing predictions, discussing purposes set, role-playing stories, retelling stories, and reconstructing stories through pictures. These activities provided children with opportunities to relate various parts of the story to each other and to integrate story information (Morrow, 1985).

Shared Reading in the Early Childhood Classroom. Because research has shown benefits of at-home "lap reading" (see McCracken & McCracken [1972] for a description of "lap reading"), many teachers use oversized texts, called "Big Books," for in-class read-alouds so that young children can experience the intimacy of at-home lap reading and can be exposed to the print and pictures as the teacher reads aloud. As the Big

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Books are read aloud, the teachers model the directionality of print, voice-to-print match, and the concept of a word by pointing to the words as they read to the children (McCracken & McCracken, 1986; Slaughter, 1983).

BECOMING A SUCCESSFUL READER: WHAT YOUNG CHILDREN NEED TO KNOW

Becoming a successful reader means orchestrating many areas of awareness, mastering specific skills, and acquiring both decoding and comprehension strategies. Children need to understand that reading is first and foremost a meaning-getting process, and they must also have adequate and accurate concepts about what print is and what words are. Children also need to learn to decode well and be able to move from letters to sounds to real words and, ultimately, to comprehend the meaning of the text they read. This section provides an overview of the several factors that are associated with becoming a successful reader: phonological awareness, alphabetic understanding, phonics instruction, and reading as a meaning-getting process.

Phonological Awareness

Research on what young children need to know about sounds in spoken words in order to be successful readers highlights the importance of learning letters and their sounds together. Research by Ohnmacht (1969) revealed that teaching children to recognize letters of the alphabet produced little benefit unless the children were also taught the sounds the letters represent. Likewise, it appears that training in recognizing sounds in spoken words has little effect on reading unless children are also taught the printed letters that represent their spoken counterparts (Bradley & Bryant, 1983).

Recent research has supported the important role of phonological awareness in learning to read (Adams, 1990; Ayres, 1995; Cornwall, 1992; Mann, 1993). Phonological awareness is the ability to hear and manipulate the constituent sounds of words. The term *phonological awareness* is inclusive in that it refers to all sizes of sound units, such as phonemes, syllables, and words, while the term *phonemic awareness* refers only to the phoneme level, the smallest unit of sound (e.g., the sound represented by the letter *p* in the word *pink*). Current research suggests that phonological awareness "is a hallmark characteristic of good readers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

while its absence is a consistent characteristic of poor readers" (Smith, Simmons, & Kameenui, 1995).

Evidence is mounting to suggest a cause-effect as well as a reciprocal relationship between phonological awareness and reading development (Adams, 1990; Seymour & Evans, 1994; Spector, 1995). It is not difficult to understand how phonological awareness is related to reading ability. A child who either does not consciously realize that words are made of sounds or who is unable to hear or manipulate sounds in words will most likely have difficulty linking letters to sounds or sounds to letters. The tasks associated with assessing phonological awareness that have been shown to predict reading performance include comparing and contrasting rhyming words, blending, syllable-splitting, phonemic segmentation, and deleting or adding phonemes to create new words (see Adams [1990] for a complete description of these tasks).

Intervention studies have demonstrated that a variety of phonological-training activities can enhance reading achievement. There is evidence to suggest that a combination of phonemic-awareness training along with letter–sound associations enhances reading development (Ball & Blachman, 1991; Byrne & Fielding-Barnsley, 1989). For example, phonemic-segmentation training, whereby kindergartners were asked to repeat sounds, move concrete objects to represent sounds, and connect letters to the sounds, improved kindergartners' reading and spelling skills more than phonics instruction alone (Ball & Blachman, 1991). In a recent study by Ayres (1995), direct instruction in phonological awareness was more effective than indirect instruction, and direct instruction was most effective when provided during the second half of the kindergarten year. Furthermore, Cunningham (1990) found that when a metacognitive strategic component of instruction was integrated with phonemic-awareness and letter–sound training, there were greater gains in kindergartners' and first-graders' reading achievement than when instruction did not include the strategic component.

Our knowledge about phonological awareness, assessment, and instruction is far from complete. One concern that research has not addressed is whether children are differentially affected by instruction that teaches phonemic awareness by focusing on segmenting phonemes only versus instruction that is embedded within more meaningful, functional contexts (L. M. McGee & Purcell-Gates, 1997).

Alphabetic Understanding

The term *alphabetic understanding* refers to the knowledge that letters represent sounds and that whole words have a structure consisting of indi-

vidual sounds and patterns of groups of sounds. Research conducted in the 1960s provided evidence to suggest that the best predictor of beginning reading achievement was a child's knowledge of letter names (Bond & Dykstra, 1967; Chall, 1967). This finding is particularly interesting in light of Ehri's (1989) finding that some children enter kindergarten knowing very few letters of the alphabet. Subsequent research on the significance of letter-name knowledge as a predictor of reading success has clarified the role of alphabetic understanding in learning to read. It appears that children's ability simply to recognize and name the letters in the alphabet is not as important as their ease and fluency in doing so (Adams, 1990).

A number of reasons have been hypothesized regarding why letter-naming speed and accuracy may be advantageous in learning to read. One hypothesis is that those children who are able to rapidly and accurately name letters have a deeper and more thorough knowledge of letters and are therefore better able to focus on patterns within words. On the other hand, children who cannot rapidly and accurately name letters appear to spend greater cognitive energy on letter discrimination. Also, because letter names are closely related to sounds, those children who are able to name letters quickly will be better able to associate letters with sounds.

Phonics Instruction

The term *letter–sound correspondence* refers to the ability to link discrete phonemes (sounds) and individual letters or patterns of letters (symbols). Phonics instruction stresses the sound–symbol relationships. In the early stages of reading and writing development, children demonstrate their awareness of letter–sound correspondence in a variety of ways. For example, in early attempts to write children use the letter names they hear in the words, such as *ppl* for people, or *kot* for coat (Harste, Burke, & Woodward, 1982). The invented spellings of young children appear to be attempts at mapping the sound system rather than a means for identifying words. In early attempts at reading children often "sound-out" the initial letter or letters in a word they are attempting to read, for example, they will voice the sound of *d* in the word *dog* or the *t* in the word *top*. While many children spontaneously begin to incorporate knowledge of letter–sound correspondence in their early reading and writing, there is converging evidence that a combination of phonemic awareness and training in letter–sound correspondence facilitates reading as well as spelling development (Adams, 1990; Ball & Blachman, 1991; Mann, 1993; Snowling, 1991).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

According to Adams (1990), the fundamental purpose of phonics instruction is to develop the students' ability to read connected text fluently. The relationship between phonics and reading connected text is an important one. Phonics can help children read more fluently while, at the same time, reading connected text for enjoyment and information may serve to reinforce students' learning of phonics.

Reading as a Meaning-Getting Process

While research clearly indicates that the most significant factor underlying fluent word reading is the ability to recognize letters, spelling patterns, and whole words easily and automatically, it is equally important to keep in mind that the ultimate goal of all reading is comprehension. As children engage in reading text, they interpret the meaning by gathering new information as they proceed through the text. This information is interpreted in light of prior knowledge and experiences (Anderson, 1977; Bowey, 1984). As reading proceeds, the reader forms judgments about the meaning of the text based on prior knowledge, but as new information is acquired from the text, the reader reevaluates the meaning of the text. Clearly, comprehension is interactive in nature and depends as much on the readers' knowledge as it does on the information revealed in the text (Mason, 1984).

Since the 1980s there has been an increasing interest in expanding children's repertoire of comprehension skills. In the late 1980s the National Assessment of Educational Progress (Applebee et al., 1988) revealed that reading instruction needed to emphasize the higher-level thinking skills and strategies that provide the foundation for interpretive and reasoning abilities. Although interest in expanding instruction in comprehension processes has increased, very few studies have examined the effects of such instruction on young readers (Block, 1993).

Block (1993) conducted a study with elementary-aged children, including grades 2 and 3, that focused on instruction designed to increase students' strategic knowledge and comprehension. Some of the comprehension strategies that were taught to the children included clarifying ideas, summarizing, making inferences, interpreting, evaluating, problem solving, and creative thinking. In this study, students were randomly assigned, by classrooms, to experimental or control conditions. In the comprehension-strategy-instruction group, students received lessons twice weekly for 32 weeks. The lessons consisted of two parts: (1) teacher explanation and modeling of a thinking and reading comprehension strategy (e.g., decoding an unknown word, predicting) using written strategy application guides, and (2) student selection of literature and application

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the previously taught cognitive strategy. In the control group students received traditional instruction that did not emphasize strategy instruction. The results revealed that the comprehension-strategy-instruction group outperformed the control group on the reading comprehension, vocabulary, and total battery sections of the Iowa Text of Basic Skills. In addition, students in the comprehension-strategy-instruction group also outperformed control students in the ability to transfer cognitive strategies to out-of-school applications and on measure of self-esteem and critical and creative thinking.

A qualitative case study was conducted by Baumann and Ivey (1997) to explore what second-grade students learned about reading, writing, and literature in a program of strategy instruction integrated within a literature-based classroom environment. During this year-long study, Baumann was the full-time classroom teacher and Ivey was a participant–observer in the classroom. Data sources included personal journals kept by both investigators, individual student interviews and interviews with parents and caregivers, videotapes of regular classroom literacy activities, artifacts of students' reading and writing, assessments of students' literacy learning, and the teacher's daily plan book. A content analysis of the data sources revealed that students grew in overall reading performance and came to view reading as a natural component of the school experience. The students demonstrated high levels of engagement with books; developed skill in word identification, fluency, and comprehension; and grew in written-composition abilities. This qualitative study provides support for the efficacy of teaching students reading and language arts strategies. Bauman and Ivey (1997) suggest

> that there is a bidirectional, mutually reinforcing relationship between the presence of a literature environment and contextualized strategy instruction. The immersion in literature and the embedded strategy instruction created a kind of symbiotic, synergistic relationship in which each program characteristic contributed to and fed off the other. In other words, the rich literature enhanced students' reading and writing fluency, and their developing literacy abilities promoted their literary knowledge and appreciation. (p. 272)

WHAT RESEARCH REVEALS ABOUT EFFECTIVE READING INSTRUCTION IN THE PRIMARY GRADES

In general, studies of effective teaching have focused on issues of classroom management and pedagogy without regard to the content being covered (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). Recently, reading researchers have be-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

gun to study effective literacy instruction in primary grade classrooms (Pressley, Rankin, & Yokoi, 1996; Wharton-McDonald, Pressley, & Mistretta, 1996). This research is grounded in the view that insights about how to teach beginning reading should come from careful study of effective teaching.

In a study of exemplary kindergarten, first-, and second-grade teachers, Pressley and colleagues (1996) asked reading supervisors around the United States to identify their very best teachers. Each of the nominated teachers was then asked to list 10 practices the teacher believed were "essential in her or his literacy instruction." The questionnaire stressed that the teacher's list should include only practices that actually occurred in her or his classroom. Responses were received from 113 of the 135 nominated teachers.

The 300 practices the teachers cited in responding to the questionnaire were categorized, and a second questionnaire was developed to specifically assess reading and writing instruction. For the second questionnaire, 86 out of 113 teachers responded (76% response rate). The questionnaire survey revealed that outstanding primary-level teachers provided literacy instruction with the following characteristics:

1. *There is a literate environment.* The classroom environment includes in-class libraries; displays of student work; chart stories/poems; posting of word lists; and listening, reading, and writing centers.
2. *Outstanding children's literature is read.* The reading of outstanding children's literature is central in the curriculum, through the use of Big Books, chart poems, and stories, as well as picture, patterned, and predictable storybooks.
3. *Students read aloud to others.* Students read aloud to the teacher and to peers, especially from stories they have written themselves.
4. *Students read along with the teacher.* There are many opportunities for students to participate in experiences such as reading along with the teacher, echo and choral reading, shared reading, daily silent reading, rereading of familiar books and stories, and reading homework (e.g., sending books home to be read with family members).
5. *Students engage in writing.* Students write stories and write in journals. They respond in writing to pictures, wordless picture books, and stories read in class. Student writing occurs in planning, drafting, and revising cycles, often culminating in a student-authored book or story.
6. *Literacy instruction is integrated across the curriculum.* Reading instruction also incorporates extension activities and experiences that relate to other areas of the curriculum.
7. *Many skills are taught.* The skills taught include those that are prerequi-

site to reading (e.g., auditory and visual discrimination, attending and listening skills), concepts of print, letters and their sounds, the alphabetic principle, decoding strategies and phonics, vocabulary and sight vocabulary, spelling, text elements (e.g., cause-effect relationships, main ideas), comprehension strategies (e.g., prediction, visualization), and critical thinking skills (e.g., brainstorming, categorization).

8. *There is a home–school connection.* There are regular communications to students' families about literacy progress and how the school and family can work together to foster literacy learning in the home.

The findings from this questionnaire/survey study are consistent with an observational study conducted by Wharton-McDonald and colleagues (1996) in nine first-grade classrooms. The three strongest teachers in this study were observed to do almost everything reported by the exemplary teachers in the Pressley and colleagues (1996) questionnaire study. When the outcomes of the two studies are combined, there is clear support for the conclusion that outstanding primary-level literacy classrooms are characterized by intense, sustained literacy experiences and are filled with high-quality reading, writing, and skills instruction.

SUMMARY

Learning to read is an extremely complex process, largely because it is the result of a number of contextual forces (Pressley, in press). It goes without saying, however, that parents and teachers are the most important variables in this complex constellation of forces. It is also clear that there are sound theoretical principles and suggestions that can be drawn from the research to provide direction for parents and teachers about effective strategies and techniques that can be used to foster literacy growth in emergent literacy learners.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print.* London: MIT Press.

Allington, R. L. (1986). Policy constraints and effective compensatory reading instruction: A review. In J. Hoffman (Ed.), *Effective teaching of reading: Research and practice* (pp. 261–289). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Allington, R. L. (1991). The legacy of "Slow it down and make it concrete." In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.), *Learner factors/teacher factors: Issues in literacy*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

research and instruction: Fortieth yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp. 19–29). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Almasi, J. F., & Gambrell, L. B. (1994). Sociocognitive conflicts in peer-led and teacher-led discussions of literature (Research Report No. 12). Athens, GA: Universities of Maryland and Georgia, National Reading Research Center.

Anderson, R. C. (1977). The notion of schemata and the educational enterprise. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, & A. Montague (Eds.), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge* (pp. 415–431). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I.A.G. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers.* Champaign: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Anderson, R. C., Wilson, P. T., & Fielding, L. G. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*(3), 285–303.

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., & Mullis, M. (1988). *Who reads best? Factors related to reading achievement in grades 3,7, and 11.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Au, K. H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11,* 91–115.

Ayres, L. R. (1995). The efficacy of three training conditions on phonological awareness of kindergarten children and the longitudinal effect of each on later reading acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(4), 604–606.

Baker, L., Serpell, R., & Sonnenschein, S. (1995). Opportunities for literacy learning in the homes of urban preschoolers. In L. M. Morrow (Ed.), *Literacy connections in families, schools, and communities* (pp. 236–252). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Ball, E. W., & Blachman, B. A. (1991). Does phoneme awareness training in kindergarten make a difference in early word recognition and developmental spelling? *Reading Research Quarterly, 24*(1), 49–66.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Baumann, J. F., & Ivey, G. (1997). Delicate balances: Striving for curricular and instructional equilibrium in a second-grade, literature/strategy-based classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly, 32*(3), 244–275.

Blatchford, P. (1987). Associations between pre-school reading-related skills and later reading achievement. *British Educational Research Journal, 13*(1), 15–23.

Block, C. C. (1993). Strategy instruction in a literature-based reading program. *The Elementary School Journal, 94*(2), 139–151.

Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. (1967). The cooperative research program in first-grade reading instruction. *Reading Reasearch Quarterly, 2,* 5–142.

Borkowski, J. G., Carr, M., Rellinger, E., & Pressley, M. (1990). Self-regulated strategy use: Interdependence of metacognition, attributions, and self-esteem. In B. F. Jones & L. Idol (Eds.), *Dimensions of thinking: Review of research* (pp. 2–60). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bowey, J. A. (1984). The interaction of strategy and context in children's oral reading performance. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 13*(2), 99–117.

Bradley, L., & Bryant, P. E. (1983). Categorizing sounds and learning to read—A causal connection. *Nature, 301,* 419–421.

Brandt, D. (1990). *Literacy as involvement: The acts of writers, readers, and text.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32,* 513–531.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, A. (1994). The advancement of learning. *Educational Researcher, 28*(8), 4–12.

Bus, A. G. (1994). The role of social context in emergent literacy. In E. M. Assink (Ed.), *Literacy acquisition and social context* (pp. 9–24). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Bus, A. G., Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Pellegrini, A. D. (1995). Joint book reading makes for success in learning to read: A meta-analysis on intergenerational transmission of literacy. *Review of Educational Research, 65,* 1–21.

Byrne, B., & Fielding-Barnsley, R. (1989). Phonemic awareness and letter knowledge in the child's acquisition of the alphabetic principle. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81,* 313–321.

Chall, J. S. (1967). *Learning to read: The great debate.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chomsky, C. (1972). Stages in language development and reading exposure. *Harvard Educational Review, 42,* 1–33.

Clay, M. M. (1977). *Reading: The patterning of complex behavior.* Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. M. (1979). *Reading: The patterning of complex behavior.* (2nd ed.). Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Cornwall, A. (1992). The relationship of phonological awareness, rapid naming and verbal memory to severe reading and spelling disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 25*(8), 532–538.

Cullinan, B. E. (1992). *Invitations to read: More children's literature in the reading program.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Cunningham, A. (1990). Explicit vs. implicit instruction in phonemic awareness. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 50,* 429–444.

Dahl, K., & Freppon, P. (1995). A comparison of inner-city children's interpretations of reading and writing instruction in the early grades in skills-based and whole language classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30,* 50–74.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum.

Dickinson, D. K., & Smith, M. W. (1994). Long-term effects of preschool teachers' book readings on low income children's vocabulary and story comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*(2), 104–122.

Dunkin, M. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1974). *The study of teaching.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Durkin, D. (1966). *Children who read early.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Dyson, A. H. (1984). Emerging literacy in school contexts: Toward defining the gap between school curriculum and child mind. *Written Communication, 1,* 5–53.

Ehri, L. C. (1979). Linguistic insight: Threshold of reading acquisition. In T. G. Waller & G. E. MacKinnan (Eds.), *Reading research: Advances in theory and practice* (Vol. 1, pp. 63–111). New York: Academic Press.

Ehri, L. C. (1989). Movement into word-reading and spelling: How spelling contributes to reading. In J. M. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections* (pp. 65–81). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Elley, W. B. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24,* 174–187.

Elley, W. B. (1992). *How in the world do students read?* Hamburg, Germany: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Fietelson, D., Goldstein, Z., Iraqi, J., & Share, D. L. (1993). Effects of listening to story reading on aspects of literacy acquisition in a diagnostic situation. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28,* 71–79.

Flavell, J. H. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *The nature of intelligence* (pp. 176–193). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flood, J. (1977). Parental styles in reading episodes with young children. *The Reading Teacher, 30,* 864–867.

Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating humans.* Newbery Park, CA: Sage.

Fox, B. J. (1990). Teaching reading in the 1990s: The strengthened focus on accountability. *Journal of Reading, 33*(5), 336–339.

Gambrell, L. B. (1993). *The impact of* RUNNING START *on the reading motivation and behavior of first-grade children* (Research Report). College Park: University of Maryland, National Reading Research Center.

Gambrell, L. B. (1995). Motivation matters. In W. M. Linek & E. G. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Generations of literacy: Seventeenth yearbook of the College Reading Association* (pp. 2–24). East Texas, TX: College Reading Association.

Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. Distinguished Educator Series. *The Reading Teacher, 50,* 14–25.

Gambrell, L. B., Almasi, J. F., Xie, Q., & Heland, V. (1995). Helping first-graders get a running start in reading. In L. Morrow (Ed.), *Family literacy: Connections in schools and communities* (pp. 143–154). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Gambrell, L. B., & Morrow, L. M. (1995). Creating motivating contexts for literacy learning. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, & D. Reinking (Eds.), *Developing engaged readers in home and school communities* (pp. 115–136). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gambrell, L. B., Palmer, B. M., Codling, R. M., & Mazzoni, S. A. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 49,* 2–19.

Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. (1979). Learning to read is natural. In L. B. Resnick & P. Weaver (Eds.), *Theory and practice of early reading* (Vol. 1, pp. 137–154). Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Guthrie, J. T. (1996). Educational contexts for engagement in literacy. *The Reading Teacher, 49*(6), 432–443.

Guthrie, J. T., Schafer, W., Wang, Y., & Afflerbach, P. (1993). *Influences of instruction on amount of reading: An empirical exploration of social, cognitive, and instructional indicators* (Reading Research Report No. 3). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Hansen, R. A., & Farrell, D. (1995). The long-term effects on high school seniors of learning to read in kindergarten. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(4), 908–933.

Harste, J. C.(1989). The basalization of American reading instruction: One researcher responds. *Theory into Practice, 28*, 265–273.

Harste, J. C., Burke, C. L., & Woodward, V. A. (1982). Children's language and world: Initial encounters with print. In J. A. Langer & M. T. Smith-Burke (Eds.), *Reader meets author/bridging the gap* (pp. 105–131). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Heath, S. B. (1980). The functions and uses of literacy. *Journal of Communication, 30*(1), 123–133.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hiebert, E. H. (1981). Developmental patterns and interrelationship of pre-school children's print awareness. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16*, 236–260.

Huck, C. S. (1992). Books for emergent readers. In C. E. Cullinan (Ed.), *Invitations to read: More children's literature in the reading program* (pp. 2–13). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Ingham, J. (1981). *Books and reading development*. London: Heinemann.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Holebec, E. J., & Roy, P. (1984). Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnston, P. H., & Winograd, P. N. (1985). Passive failure in reading. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 17*(4), 279–301.

Kaestle, C. F., Damon-Moore, H., Stedman, L. C., Tinsley, K., & Trollinger, Jr., W. V. (1991). *Literacy in the United States*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lomax, C. (1976). Interest in books and stories at nursery school. *Educational Research, 19*, 100–112.

Lundberg, I., & Linnakyla, P. (1993). *Teaching reading around the world*. Hamburg, Germany: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Mann, V. A. (1993). Phoneme awareness and future reading ability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26*(4), 259–269.

Mason, J. M. (1983, March). *Acquisition of knowledge about reading in the preschool period: An update and extension*. Paper presented at the Convention of the Society of Research in Child Development, Detroit.

Mason, J. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of the reading process as a basis for comprehension instruction. In G. G. Duffy, L. R. Roehler, & J. Mason (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Perspectives and suggestions* (pp. 26–38). New York: Longman.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

McCombs, B. L. (1989). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A phenomenological view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 51–82). New York: Springer-Verlag.

McCracken, M., & McCracken J. (1972). *Reading is the only tiger's tail.* San Rafael, CA: Lewsing.

McCracken, R. A., & McCracken, M. J. (1986). *Stories, songs, and poetry to teach reading and writing.* Chicago: American Library Association.

McGee, K. G. (1992). An exploration of meaning construction in first graders' grand conversations. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Literacy research, theory, and practice: Views from many perspectives,* 41st Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

McGee, L. M., & Purcell-Gates, V. (1997). So what's going on in research on emergent literacy? *Reading Research Quarterly, 32*(3), 310–318.

McGill-Franzen, A., & Lanford, C. (1994). Exposing the edge of the preschool curriculum: Teachers' talk about text and children's literacy understandings. *Language Arts, 71,* 264–273.

McKenna, M. C., Kear, D. J., & Ellsworth, R. A. (1995). Children's attitudes toward reading: A national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(4), 934–956.

Meyerhoff, M. K., & White, B. L. (1986). New parents as teachers. *Educational Leadership, 44*(3), 42–46.

Morphett, M. V., & Washburne, C. (1931). When should children begin to read? *Elementary School Journal, 31,* 496–508.

Morrow, L. M. (1983). Home and school correlates of early interest in literature. *Journal of Educational Research, 76,* 221–230.

Morrow, L. M. (1985). *Promoting voluntary reading in school and home.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Morrow, L. M. (1992). The impact of a literature-based program on literacy achievement, use of literature, and attitudes of children from minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly, 27,* 250–275.

Morrow, L. M., & O'Connor, E. (1995). Literacy partnerships for change with "at risk" kindergartners. In R. Allington & B. Walmsley (Eds.), *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools* (pp. 97–115). New York: Guilford.

Morrow, L. M., & Rand, M. K. (1994, Spring). *Physical and social contexts for motivating reading and writing: The* WRAP *program* (Instructional Resource No. 5). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Morrow, L. M., & Smith, J. K. (1990). The effects of group size on interactive storybook reading. *Reading Research Quarterly, 25*(3), 213–231.

Morrow, L. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (1982). Increasing children's use of literature through programs and physical design changes. *Elementary School Journal, 83,* 131–137.

Mullis, I., Campbell, J., & Farstrup, A. (1993). NAEP reading report card for the nation and the states. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Neuman, S. B., & Roskos, K. (1997). Literacy knowledge in practice: Contexts of participation for young writers and readers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 32*(1), 10–32.

Ng, M. M., Guthrie, J. T., McCann, A. D., VanMeter, P. V., & Alao, S. (1996, Summer). *How do classroom characteristics influence intrinsic motivation for literacy?* (Reading Research Report No. 56). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Ohnmacht, D.C. (1969, April). *The effects of letter knowledge on achievement in reading in the first grade.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles. Reviewed in Ehri, L. (1983). Summary of Dorothy C. Ohnmacht's study: The effects of letter knowledge on achievement in reading in the first grade. In L. M. Gentile, M. L. Kamil, & J. S. Blanchard (Eds.), *Reading research revisited* (pp. 141–142). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Oldfather, P. (1993). What students say about motivating experiences in a whole language classroom. *The Reading Teacher, 46,* 672–681.

Orsolini, M., & Pontecorvo, C. (1992). Children's talk in classroom discussions. *Cognition and Instruction, 9*(2), 113–136.

Palmer, B. M., Codling, R. M., & Gambrell, L. B. (1994). In their own words: What elementary children have to say about motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 48,* 176–179.

Paris, S., & Oka, E. R. (1986). Children's reading strategies, metacognition, and motivation. *Developmental Review, 6,* 25–56.

Pressley, M. C. (in press). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching.* New York: Guilford.

Pressley, M. C., Rankin, J., & Yokoi, Y. (1996). A survey of instructional practices of primary teachers nominated as effective in promoting literacy. *Elementary School Journal, 96*(4), 363–384.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1988). Lexical and syntactic knowledge of written narrative held by well-read-to kindergartners and second graders. *Research in the Teaching of English, 22,* 128–160.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1994). Nonliterate homes and emergent literacy. In D. F. Lancy (Ed.), *Children's emergent literacy: From research to practice* (pp. 41–51). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1996). Stories, coupons, and the *TV Guide*: Relationships between home literacy experiences and emergent literacy knowledge. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*(4), 406–428.

Purcell-Gates, V., & Dahl, K. (1991). Low-SES children's success and failure at early literacy learning in skills-based classrooms. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 23,* 1–34.

Purcell-Gates, V., McIntyre, E., & Freppon, P. (1995). Learning written storybook language in school: A comparison of low-SES children in skills-based and whole language classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 32,* 659–685.

Rodin, J., Rennert, K., & Solomon, S. (1980). Intrinsic motivation for control: Fact or fiction. In A. Baum, J. E. Singer, & S. Valins (Eds.), *Advances in environmental psychology II* (pp. 177–186). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Rowe, K. J. (1991). The influence of reading activity at home on students' attitudes toward reading, classroom attentiveness and reading achievement. An application of structural equation modelling. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 61,* 19–35.

Seymour, P. H. K., & Evans, H. M. (1994). Levels of phonological awareness and learning to read. *Reading and Writing, 6,* 221–250.

Slaughter, J. P. (1983). Big Books for little kids: Another fad or a new approach for teaching beginning reading? *The Reading Teacher, 36,* 758–763.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, F. (1988). *Joining the literacy club: Further essays into education.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Smith-Burke, T. M. (1989). Political and economic dimensions of literacy: Challeges for the 1990s. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction* (pp. 1–18). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Snowling, M. (1991). Words, nonwords, phonological processes: Some comments on Gathercole, Willis, Emslie, and Baddeley. *Applied Linguistics, 12*(3), 369–373.

Sonnenschein, S., Baker, L., Serpell, R., Scher, D., Fernandez-Fein, S., & Munsterman, K. A. (1996, Winter). *Strands of emergent literacy and their antecedents in the home: Urban preschoolers' early literacy development* (Reading Research Report No. 48). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center, Universities of Maryland and Georgia.

Spaulding, C. L. (1992). The motivation to read and write. In J. W. Irwin & M. A. Doyle (Eds.), *Reading/writing connections: Learning from research* (pp. 177–201). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Spector, J. (1995). Phonemic awareness training: Application of principles of direct instruction. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 11,* 37–51.

Sticht, T. G., & McDonald, B. A. (1989). *Making the nation smarter: The intergenerational transfer of cognitive ability.* San Diego, CA: Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences.

Sulzby, E. (1985). Children's emergent reading of favorite storybooks: A developmental study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 458–481.

Sulzby, E., & Teale, W. (1991). Emergent literacy. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 2, pp. 727–758). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Swap, S. (1993). *Developing home–school partnerships.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Taylor, B. M., Frye, B. J., & Maruyama, G. M. (1990). Time spent reading and reading growth. *American Educational Research Journal, 27,* 351–362.

Taylor, D., & Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988). *Growing up literate.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Teale, W. (1984). Reading to young children: Its significance for literacy development. In H. Goelman, A. Obserg, & F. Smith (Eds.), *Awakening to literacy* (pp. 110–121). Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teale, W., & Sulzby, E. (1987). Literacy acquisition in early childhood. In D. Wagner (Ed.), *The future of literacy in a changing world* (Vol. I, pp. 120–129). New York: Pergamon.

Teale, W., & Sulzby, E. (1988). *Emergent literacy: Writing and reading.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Turner, J. C. (1992, April). *Identifying motivation for literacy in first grade: An observational study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Turner, J. C. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(3), 410–441.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Speech and thinking. In R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), & N. Minick (Tr.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky* (Vol. 1, pp. 39–285). New York: Plenum.

Wells, G. (1986). *The meaning makers: Children learning language and using language to learn.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Wharton-McDonald, R., Pressley, M., & Mistretta, J. (1996). *Outstanding literary instruction in first grade: Teaching practices and student achievement.* Albany, NY: National Reading Research Center.

Whitehurst, G. J., & Lonigan, C. J. (1998). Child development and emergent literacy. *Child Development, 69,* 848–873.

Wigfield, A. (1994, April). *Dimensions of children's motivations for reading: An intitial study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Wigfield, A., & Asher, S. R. (1984). Social and motivational influences on reading. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds)., *Handbook of research on reading* (pp. 423–452). New York: Longman.

Wigfield, A., & Karpathian, M. (1991). Who am I and what can I do? Children's self-concepts and motivation in motivational theory and research. *Educational Psychologist, 26*(3,4), 233–261.

Wiseman, D. L., Many, J. E., & Altieri, J. (1992). Enabling complex aesthetic responses: An examination of three literary discussion approaches. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Literary research, theory, and practice: Views from many perspectives, 41st Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 283–290). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE